

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DAVID ALLEN GILLUM,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAPTAIN DEAN OWENS, individually, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C19-1859-RSM-BAT

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff David Allen Gillum's "Motion to Withdraw Settlement Agreement and Counsel," Dkt. #83. Mr. Gillum is clearly moving for reconsideration of the Court's Order at Dkt. #82 denying his prior motion to withdraw his settlement agreement. Dkt. #83 at 1 ("The plaintiff is asking the courts to reconsider...").

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." LCR 7(h)(1). "The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "The motion shall point out with specificity the matters which the movant believes were overlooked or misapprehended by the court, any new matters being brought to the court's attention for the first time, and the particular modifications being sought

1 in the court's prior ruling." LCR 7(h)(2). No response to a motion for reconsideration shall be
2 filed unless requested by the court. LCR 7(h)(3).

3 The Court has determined that a response brief is unnecessary.

4 The Court relies on its prior findings from Dkt. #82, incorporated herein. The main point
5 of Mr. Gillum's latest filing is that the settlement at issue was obtained without his full consent
6 and that he was taken advantage of by the attorneys involved. *See* Dkt. #83. He states that the
7 mediation was fraudulent and that his attorney committed malpractice. The Court finds that Mr.
8 Gillum has failed to demonstrate any manifest error in the prior ruling or new facts or legal
9 authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.
10 Accordingly, this Motion will be denied.
11

12
13 Having considered the briefing from the parties and the remainder of the record, the Court
14 hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff David Allen Gillum's "Motion to Withdraw Settlement
15 Agreement and Counsel," Dkt. #83, is DENIED. This case remains CLOSED.

16 DATED this 22nd day of March, 2022.
17
18

19
20 

21 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
22 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28